



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/081,484

02/20/2002

Shell S. Simpson

10007664 -1

1490

7590

07/26/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/081,484	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SIMPSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jungwon Chang	<b>Art Unit</b> 2154	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-15,17,18,24 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-15,17,18,24 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**FINAL ACTION**

1. This Action is in response to amendment filed on 4/27/06. Claims 2, 11, 16 and 19-23 are canceled. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17, 18, 24 and 25 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 5-8, 13-17 and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (US 6,453,127), hereinafter Wood, in view of Johnson et al. (US 2002/0152210), hereinafter Johnson, Wang (US 2003/0009537).

4. As to claims 1 and 24, Wood discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a system, comprising:

(a) a Web client computer (11, figs. 1 & 2) coupled to a network (12, fig. 1) (col. 2, lines 50-53) and operable by a user having a personal repository for storing job documents (col. 2, lines 58-67; col. 3, lines 11-22); and

(b) a Web site (30, fig. 1; 32, fig. 2) coupled to the network (12, fig. 1) (col. 2,

Art Unit: 2154

lines 50-53) and operable to cause the client to display a Web page (fig. 4) that includes *information regarding* web resource that is available over the network (12, fig. 1) in order to access a user's job document when the user is actively making use of the resource (fig. 4; col. 2, lines 11-17; col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 7).

5. Wood does not specifically disclose API for accessing the user's personal repository. Johnson discloses API (102, fig. 2, "client API") for accessing the user's personal repository (110, fig. 2) (page 1, 0008; page 2, 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wood and Johnson because Johnson's API would enable the user to search, update, display, add and manage content in the user's personal repository (Johnson, page 2, 0022).

Wood does not specifically disclose a portal web page including a plurality of hyperlinks each pointing to a unique Web resource that is available over the network. Wang discloses a portal web page including a plurality of hyperlinks each pointing to a unique Web resource that is available over the network (figs. 12-13; page 19, 0200-0202; page 21, 0225; page 30, 0345). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wood and Wang because Wang's portal web page including a hyperlinks would allow the user to select a particular device of interest by clicking on the representation of the device (Wang, page 8, 0104).

6. As to claim 5, Wood discloses the web page includes at least one advertisement of a web resource (web page has an inherent functionality that includes advertising hyperlink or banner) that can make use of the interface to access a user's job document when the user is making use of the resource (fig. 4; col. 2, lines 11-17; col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 7).

7. As to claim 6, Wood discloses the web site generates the web page based, at least in part, upon the user's job document (fig. 4; col. 1, lines 47-59; col. 6, lines 1-34).

8. As to claim 7, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Wood discloses a web server computer (30, fig. 1; 32, fig. 2) comprising:

(a) means for receiving a request from a client computer over a network (col. 5, lines 3-6); and

(b) means for responding to the request by sending the client computer at least one Web page (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 45-52; col. 6, lines 1-34).

9. As to claims 8 and 13, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 5 above.

10. As to claim 14, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 6 above.

11. As to claim 15, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 7 above. In addition, Wood discloses wherein each of the web resources configured to make use of a common interface in order to access a user's pre-selected document when the user is actively making use of the resource (col. 3, lines 49-65; col. 5, line 62 – col. 6, line 34; col. 6, lines 41-54).

12. As to claim 16, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 2 above.

13. As to claim 17, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 5 above.

14. **Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 12 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood, in view of Johnson, Wang, and further in view of Gopalan (US 2003/0076526).

15. As to claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 12 and 18, Wood discloses web site (30, fig. 2) includes a memory (37, 39, fig. 2) of information regarding web resources that are available over the network and that can make use of the interface in order to access an active user's job document (col. 4, lines 41-45; col. 6, lines 35-54; col. 7, lines 1-20). However, wood does not specifically disclose web site including a browsable database (106, fig. 1; page 2, 0023; page 3, 0037). Gopalan discloses web site (104, fig. 1) including a browsable database (106, fig. 1; page 2, 0023; page 3, 0037). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings

of Wood, Johnson, Wang and Gopalan because Gopalan's database would reduce operating costs by providing searchable database of online public records (Gapalan; page 1, 0005).

16. **Claim 25** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopalan (US 2003/0076526) in view of Johnson et al. (US 2002/0152210), hereinafter Johnson, and Wang (US 2003/0009537).

17. As to claim 25, Gopalan discloses a method, comprising:

providing a client computer (400, fig. 4);

displaying a web page on the client computer that includes a plurality of hyperlinks, each pointing to a Web resource that is configured to communicate with a common interface in order to access a user's job document when the user is actively using the resource (figs 6 & 7; page 1, 0006; page 4, 0041-0045).

18. Gapalan does not specifically disclose API for accessing the user's personal repository. Johnson discloses API (102, fig. 2, "client API") for accessing the user's personal repository (110, fig. 2) (page 1, 0008; page 2, 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gapalan and Johnson because Johnson's API would enable the user to search, update, display, add and manage content in the user's personal repository (Johnson, page 2, 0022).

Gapalan disclose a web page including a plurality of hyperlinks each pointing to a unique Web resource that is available over the network (figs. 6-7). However, Gapalan does not specifically disclose a portal web page. Wang discloses a portal web page (figs. 12-13; page 19, 0200-0202; page 21, 0225; page 30, 0345). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gapalan and Wang because Wang's portal web page including a hyperlinks would allow the user to select a particular device of interest by clicking on the representation of the device (Wang, page 8, 0104).

### ***Conclusion***

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17, 18, 24 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not




mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-3960. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Jungwon Chang  
Primary Examiner  
July 17, 2006